UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/529,201	05/18/00	WATSON D	P/61209

MM92/0705

KIRSCHSTEIN OTTINGER ISRAEL & SCHIFFMILL
489 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10017-6105

EXAMINER	
DUONG, T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2871	13

DATE MAILED:
07/05/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/529,201	Watson
Examiner	**Art Unit**
TAI DUONG	2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *33-52* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *33-41, 43-45, 47, 48, and 50-52* is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *42, 46, and 49* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). *4, 8, 9*

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other:

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP No. 06-003633 cited by Applicant.

Note the Abstract which identically discloses the claimed comprising the step of removing the excess area from the finished area of the LCD to obtain the desired area of the custom-made display.

Claims 33, 34, 40, 41, 50 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by An et al (US 5,851,411).

Note col. 6, lines 36-44, and Figs. 5-17 which identically discloses the claimed method comprising the step of removing the excess area from the finished area to obtain the desired area of the custom-made display. The step of reducing the viscosity of the liquid crystal is inherently included in the step of sealing the injection hole due to heating (see Yasutake et al'058; col. 4, lines 10-14).

Claims 33, 43, 47, 48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Koyama et al (US 6,246,454).

Note Figs. 9 - 10, and col. 5, lines 13-35 which identically disclose the claimed method comprising the step of removing the excess area from the finished area to obtain the desired area of the custom-made display. As to claims 47 and 48, note Fig.5.

Claims 33 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue et al (US 5,854,664) .

Note Fig. 8 and col. 10, lines 20-64 which identically disclose the claimed method comprising the step of removing the excess area from the finished area to obtain the desired area and the step of resealing the unsealed edges.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35-39, 41, 44, 45 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over An et al in view of Yasutake et al (US 4,094,058) .

Yasutake et al disclose that the cutting equipment and the method for cutting (removing step) will depend on upon the type of the substrate. Further, Yasutake et al disclose that "(I)f the substrate is glass, the cutting may be with a diamond saw, by heated wire, by scribing and other

known methods of cutting glass. For other materials, suitable known cutting techniques may be employed" (col. 3, lines 42-52). Although An et al do not disclose the various cutting techniques as recited in claims 35-38, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in view of Yasutake et al to employ the suitable known cutting techniques in the method of An et al for shorting the time of the cutting process and facilitating the cutting process of a particular type of substrates without damaging the finished display. As to claim 39, for the most common transmissive twisted nematic liquid crystal displays, two polarizers are required for operation and each one of the polarizers is attached to each of the plates, as is well-known in the art. As to claim 45, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to peel the polarizer before performing the removing step for saving the polarizer for later use As to claim 51, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to cut the plates along a direction at an oblique angle relative to the plates for the ease of the cutting process as compared to the perpendicular cutting.

Claims 42, 46 and 49 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Tai Duong at telephone number (703) 308-4873.

TD
7/2/01

Minh-Toan T. Ton
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800